

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

No. 6:24-cv-00486

Social Heath,
Plaintiff,

v.

Timisha Propps,
Defendant.

ORDER


Plaintiff Social Heath, proceeding pro se, filed this civil-rights lawsuit against defendant on December 20, 2024. Doc. 1. This case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Doc. 2. On December 26, 2024, the magistrate judge issued a report recommending that plaintiff's claims be dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Doc. 3. A copy of the report was mailed to plaintiff at his listed address, but the report was returned as undeliverable. Doc. 4. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the report.

The complaint form plaintiff filed contains a declaration stating: "I understand . . . it is my responsibility to keep the court informed of my current mailing address and failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this lawsuit." Doc. 1 at 5. The Local Rules similarly state that a pro se litigant "must provide the court with a physical address . . . and is responsible for keeping the clerk advised in writing of his or her current physical address." E.D. Tex. Local Rule CV-11(d); *see also Anderson v. Munger*, No. 5:17-cv-00175, 2019 WL 2929056, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 8, 2019) ("The Court has no duty to locate litigants . . .").

When there have been no timely objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the court reviews it only for clear error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996). Having reviewed the magistrate judge's report, and being satisfied that it contains no clear error, the court

accepts its findings and recommendation. Plaintiff's claims are dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Any pending motions are denied as moot.

So ordered by the court on April 30, 2025.



J. CAMPBELL BARKER
United States District Judge